

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

-----X
In re Application of : Examiner: Hien D. Vu
Andre LISCHECK et al. :
For: ELECTRICAL CONNECTOR IN THE :
FORM OF A SOCKET CONTACT :
HAVING A SPECIAL LAMELLAR :
CONSTRUCTION :
Filed: September 29, 2003 : Art Unit: 2833
Serial No.: 10/674,578 :
-----X

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

SIR:

On March 10, 2008, Appellants filed a Notice of Appeal from the last decision of the Examiner contained in the Final Office Action dated October 11, 2007 in the above-identified patent application.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 41.37, this brief is submitted in support of the appeal of the rejections of claims 1 to 7. For at least the reasons set forth below, the final rejections of claims 1 to 7 should be reversed.

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in the present appeal is ROBERT BOSCH GmbH of Stuttgart in the Federal Republic of Germany, which is the assignee of the entire right, title and interest in and to the present application.

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other prior or pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings known by the undersigned, or believed by the undersigned to be known to Appellants or the assignee, ROBERT BOSCH GmbH, "which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal."

3. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 to 7 are pending.

Claims 1 to 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1 to 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 4,168,878 ("Risser et al.") and U.S. Patent No. 5,135,417 ("Stanevich").

A copy of the appealed claims, *i.e.*, claims 1 to 7, is attached hereto in the Claims Appendix.

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

In response to the Final Office Action dated October 11, 2007, Appellants submitted a "Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116" ("the Reply") on January 7, 2008. The Reply did not include any proposed amendments to the claims. As such, it is Appellants' understanding that the claims as included in the annexed "Claims Appendix" reflects the current status of the claims.

5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 1 relates to an electrical connector 1 in the form of a socket contact. *Specification*, page 4, line 4, and Figure 1. Claim 1 recites that the electrical connector 1 includes an inner contact part 2. *Specification*, page 4, lines 4 to 5, and Figure 1. Claim 1 recites that the electrical connector 1 includes a spring element 3 adapted to be placed over the inner contact part 2. *Specification*, page 4, lines 4 to 6, and Figure 1. Claim 1 recites that the inner contact part 2 includes an attachment part 4 for receiving a bare end of an electrical line. *Specification*, page 4, lines 8 to 9, and Figure 1. Claim 1 recites that the inner contact part 2 includes a center segment 5. *Specification*, page 4, lines 8 to 9, and Figures 1 and 2. Claim 1 recites that the inner contact part 2 includes a contact segment 6

having a contact part. *Specification*, page 4, lines 8 to 9, and Figures 1 and 2. Claim 1 recites that the contact segment 6 having the contact part includes at least three contact lamellae 7 pointing away from the center segment 5. *Specification*, page 4, lines 13 to 15, and Figures 1 and 2. Claim 1 recites that the contact lamellae 7 are freely movable. *Specification*, page 4, lines 13 to 16, and Figures 1 and 2. Claim 1 recites that each of the contact lamellae 7 includes at least one contact point 10 for producing an electrical plug connection to a knife blade 14. *Specification*, page 4, lines 17 to 21, and Figures 2 and 5. Claim 1 recites that the contact lamellae 7 are configured to spring off freely at a beginning of an insertion of a knife blade 14 into the contact segment 6. *Specification*, page 4, line 32 to page 5, line 4, and Figures 1 to 5. Claim 1 recites that after further insertion of the knife blade 14, only free ends 7' of the contact lamellae 7 are configured to come to rest against the spring element 3 in direct proximity to the contact point 10 with the knife blade 14 maintaining contact with the contact segment 6 and contact point 10. *Specification*, page 5, lines 6 to 12, and Figures 1 to 5.

Independent claim 5 relates to an electrical connector 1 in the form of a socket contact. *Specification*, page 4, line 4, and Figure 1. Claim 5 recites that the electrical connector 1 includes an inner contact part 2. *Specification*, page 4, lines 4 to 5, and Figure 1. Claim 5 recites that the electrical connector includes a spring element 3 adapted to be placed over the inner contact part 2. *Specification*, page 4, lines 4 to 6, and Figure 1. Claim 5 recites that the inner contact part 2 includes an attachment part 4 for receiving a bare end of an electrical line. *Specification*, page 4, lines 8 to 9, and Figure 1. Claim 5 recites that the inner contact part 2 includes a center segment 5. *Specification*, page 4, lines 8 to 9, and Figures 1 and 2. Claim 5 recites that the inner contact part 2 includes a contact segment 6 having a contact part. *Specification*, page 4, lines 8 to 9, and Figures 1 and 2. Claim 5 recites that the contact segment 6 having the contact part includes at least three contact lamellae 7 pointing away from the center segment 5. *Specification*, page 4, lines 13 to 15, and Figures 1 and 2. Claim 5 recites that the contact lamellae 7 are freely movable. *Specification*, page 4, lines 13 to 16, and Figures 1 and 2. Claim 5 recites that each of the contact lamellae 7 includes at least one contact point 10 for producing an electrical plug connection to a knife blade 14. *Specification*, page 4, lines 17 to 21, and Figures 2 and 5. Claim 5 recites that the contact lamellae 7 are spaced from the spring element 3 along an entire length of the contact lamellae 7 prior to insertion of a knife blade 14 into the contact part 2. *Specification*, page 4, lines 25 to 27, and Figures 1, 2, and 4. Claim 5 recites that the contact lamellae 7 are configured to interact with the knife blade 14, which maintains contact with the contact

segment 6 and contact point 10, so as to contact the spring element 3 in direct proximity to the at least one contact point 10. *Specification*, page 4, line 32 to page 5, line 12, and Figures 1 to 5.

6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

- A. Whether claims 1 to 7 comply with the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.
- B. Whether claims 1 to 7 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Risser et al. and Stanevich.

7. ARGUMENT

A. Rejection of Claims 1 to 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1 to 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1 to 7 fully satisfy the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, the Office bears the initial burden of presenting “evidence or reasons why persons skilled in the art would not recognize in an applicant’s disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims.” (See M.P.E.P. § 2163.04 (citing *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 262, 265, 191 U.S.P.Q. 90, 96, 98 (C.C.P.A. 1976)) (emphasis added)). The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure also provides that if an examiner rejects a claim based on the lack of a written description, the examiner should “identify the claim limitation not described” and provide “reasons why persons skilled in the art would not recognize the description of this limitation in the disclosure of the application.” (See id.). However, the written description requirement is not an *in haec verba* requirement. That is, “the specification ‘need not describe the claimed subject matter in exactly the same terms as used in the claims; it must simply indicate to persons skilled in the art that as of the [filing] date the applicant had invented what is now claimed.’” *All Dental Prodx LLC v. Advantage Dental Products Inc.*, 64 U.S.P.Q.2d 1945, 1948 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (quoting *Eiselstein v. Frank*, 52 F.3d 1035, 1038, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1467, 1470 (Fed. Cir. 1995)). Moreover, a “failure of the specification to specifically mention a limitation that later appears in the claims is not a fatal one when one skilled in the art would recognize upon reading the specification that the new language reflects what the specification shows has been invented.” *All Dental Prodx*, 64 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1948 (citing *Eiselstein*, 52 F.3d at 1039, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d at

1470). An applicant can show “possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention.” M.P.E.P. § 2163 (citing *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 U.S.P.Q.2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997)).

The Final Office Action alleges that the features of *free ends of contact lamellae configured to come to rest against a spring element in direct proximity to a contact point*, as recited in claim 1, and *contact lamellae configured to interact with a knife blade so as to contact a spring element in direct proximity to at least one contact point*, as recited in claim 5, constitute new matter. Specifically, the Final Office Action states that “the original Fig. 1 does not show free ends 7’ are adjacent a retention spring entrance port for a knife blade 14.” (Final Office Action, October 11, 2007, p. 5). Appellants respectfully disagree. Original Figure 1 does show contact lamellae 7 inserted into retention spring 3 such that free ends 7’ are adjacent a retention spring entrance port for a knife blade 14.

First, the Specification states that “Figure 1 shows a perspective view of the electrical connector according to the present invention, including an inner contact part and an external retention spring[, and] Figure 2 shows a perspective view of a portion of the inner contact part according to Figure 1, but, in contrast to Figure 1, without the external retention spring.” (Specification, p. 3, line 29 to p. 4, line 1). Thus, the Specification makes clear that the inner contact part including contact lamellae 7 and free ends 7’ shown in original Figure 2 is also shown within external retention spring 3 in original Figure 1. As a result, since original Figure 1 shows contact lamellae 7 and free ends 7’ within external retention spring 3, original Figure 1 clearly shows the free ends 7’ of the contact lamellae 7 are adjacent a retention spring entrance port for a knife blade 14. Further, although the free ends 7’ of the contact lamellae 7 are not explicitly labeled in original Figures 1 and 2, it is respectfully submitted that persons skilled in the art would recognize the ends of the contact lamellae 7 pointing away from the center segment 5 to be the free ends 7’ of the contact lamellae 7.

In addition, the Specification states that upon insertion of a knife blade, “the contact lamellae must, in the event of further expansion of the contact lamellae clearance, give way in the direction of the entrance port for the knife blade prior to running up against the limiting elements of the entrance port of the external retention spring 3.” (Specification, p. 5, lines 5 to 8). Thus, the Specification makes clear that the contact lamellae 7 give way in the direction of the retention spring entrance port, which is in a direction away from the center segment 5. Since the free ends 7’ of the contact lamellae 7 are pointing away from the

center segment 5, the free ends 7' of the contact lamellae 7 necessarily are adjacent a retention spring entrance port for a knife blade 14.

The Final Office Action also states that “the original Fig. 2 does not show the contact region 9, including contact point 10, is in direct proximity to the free ends 7' of the contact lamellae 7.” (Final Office Action, October 11, 2007, p. 5). As more fully set forth above, original Figures 1 and 2 both clearly show the free ends 7' of the contact lamellae 7. Again, although the free ends 7' of the contact lamellae 7 are not explicitly labeled in original Figures 1 and 2, it is respectfully submitted that persons skilled in the art would recognize the ends of the contact lamellae 7 pointing away from the center segment 5 to be the free ends 7' of the contact lamellae 7. Therefore, the contact point 10 of contact region 9 is shown in both original Figures 1 and 2 to be in direct proximity to the free ends 7' of the contact lamellae 7.

Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit that the features of *free ends of the contact lamellae configured to come to rest against the spring element in direct proximity to the contact point*, as recited in claim 1, and *the contact lamellae are configured to interact with the knife blade so as to contact the spring element in direct proximity to the at least one contact point*, as recited in claim 5, do not constitute new matter.

The Final Office Action also alleges that the features of *the knife blade maintaining contact with the contact segment and contact point*, as recited in claim 1, and *the knife blade, which maintains contact with the contact segment and contact point*, as recited in claim 5, constitute new matter. Specifically, the Final Office Action states that “it is unclear how the knife blade could maintain contact with both the contact segment and the contact point. It appears that the blade could only maintain contact with the contact point only.” (Final Office Action, October 11, 2007, p. 2). Appellants respectfully disagree. The Specification makes clear that the knife blade maintains contact with the contact segment and contact point.

First, the Specification states that the contact segment 6 includes contact lamellae 7, which includes a contact region 9, which further includes a contact point 10. (Specification, p. 4, lines 13 to 21; and Abstract, lines 8 to 10). Thus, the Specification makes clear that the contact point 10 is one portion included within the contact segment 6. As a result, it is clearly possible for the knife blade to maintain contact with both the contact segment and contact point.

In addition, the Specification states that an object of the present invention is to increase the contact reliability by ensuring optimal normal contact force of each contact lamella. (Specification, p. 3, lines 2 to 5; and p. 5, lines 18 to 20). Thus, the Specification

makes clear that contact reliability can be achieved by ensuring optimal normal contact force at each contact point of each contact lamella. It follows that optimal normal contact force at each contact point can only be achieved by maintaining contact between the knife blade and the contact segment and contact point, even on further insertion of the knife blade. Therefore, the Specification makes clear that the knife blade maintains contact with the contact segment and contact point.

Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit that the features of *the knife blade maintaining contact with the contact segment and contact point*, as recited in claim 1, and *the knife blade, which maintains contact with the contact segment and contact point*, as recited in claim 5, do not constitute new matter.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 to 7 fully comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

In view of all of the foregoing, reversal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Rejection of Claims 1 to 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 to 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 4,168,878 (“Risser et al.”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,135,417 (“Stanevich”). Appellants respectfully submit that the combination of Risser et al. and Stanevich does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

As set forth in the “Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,” 72 Fed. Reg. 57526 (October 10, 2007) (and M.P.E.P. § 2143), the key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of reasons why the claimed subject matter would have been obvious, and rejections for obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements. Rather, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Among the rationales enumerated in the Guidelines are: (a) combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results; (b) simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results; (c) use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way; (d) applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results; (e) “obvious to try” - choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success; (f) known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it

for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art; and (g) some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

The Final Office Action refers to an alleged motivation to modify or combine, and states that “the motivation for the rejection is found in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.” (Final Office Action, October 11, 2007, p. 6). However, it is respectfully submitted that that type of conclusory statement is insufficient to establish unpatentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The M.P.E.P. states that “[t]o reject a claim based on this rationale [of some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention], . . . Office personnel must articulate the following: (1) a finding that there was some teaching, suggestion, or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; (2) a finding that there was reasonable expectation of success; and (3) whatever additional findings based on the *Graham* factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.” (M.P.E.P. § 2143 (emphasis added)).

It is respectfully submitted that neither the Advisory Action nor any of the prior Office Actions to date has articulated at least (1) a finding that there was some teaching, suggestion, or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, or (2) a finding that there was reasonable expectation of success, as is required by the M.P.E.P.

Claim 1 recites the features of “the contact lamellae are configured to spring off freely at a beginning of an insertion of a knife blade into the contact segment, and, after further insertion of the knife blade, *only free ends of the contact lamellae configured to come to rest against the spring element in direct proximity to the contact point with the knife blade maintaining contact with the contact segment and contact point.*” Further, claim 5 recites the features of “*the contact lamellae are configured to interact with the knife blade, which maintains contact with the contact segment and contact point, so as to contact the spring element in direct proximity to the at least one contact point.*”

In contrast, Risser et al. purportedly relate to pin and socket type electrical terminals. The Final Office Action admits that Risser does not disclose “after further insertion of the blade, the free ends configured to rest against the spring element and the contact lamellae configured to deform.” (Final Office Action, October 11, 2007, p. 3). Stanevich purportedly relates to a dual usage electrical/electronic pin terminal system. For the reasons detailed below, Appellants respectfully submit that the combination of Risser et al. and Stanevich does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the claimed features of claims 1 and 5.

The plug connector of the present application has an inner contact part 2 and a retention spring 3, which at least partially encloses the inner contact part 2. A knife blade 14 inserted into the plug connector contacts the inner contact part 2 at contact point 10 forcing the lamellae 7 apart such that the free ends 7' of the lamellae 7, which are in direct proximity to the contact point 10, contact the inner surface of the retention spring 3 and remain in direct proximity to the contact point 10. The proximity of the contact point 10 and the point where the free ends 7' of the lamellae 7 contact the inner surface of the retention spring 3 assures that the contact between the lamellae 7 and the retention spring 3 adequately transmits a bracing effect to the lamellae 7 at contact point 10. In contrast, as shown in Figure 7 of Stanevich, the point on the Stanevich device adjacent reference number 20 (where the springs 17, 18 contact retention spring 14) is on an opposite end of the springs 17, 18 from contact points 24 (where the springs 17, 18 contact element 11). Thus, the point adjacent reference number 20 is spaced away from contact points 24 of springs 17, 18. Therefore, the contact between the Stanevich retention spring 14 and springs 17, 18 does not provide the same level of bracing support at the contact points 24 between element 11 and the springs 17, 18, as that achieved by the electrical connector embodiment configuration of presently pending claims 1 and 5.

The Final Office Action alleges that the free ends of the contact lamellae in Figure 7 of Stanevich are configured to rest against the spring element in direct proximity to the contact point. Claims 1 and 5 make clear that the contact point refers to the point in which knife blade is in contact with when the free ends of the contact lamellae contact the retention spring. The lamellae of Stanevich contact the knife blade at two points. During initial insertion, as shown in Figure 6 of Stanevich, the knife blade first contacts the lamellae at point 22, but the lamellae have not expanded sufficiently to contact the retention spring 14. Therefore, point 22 does not constitute a contact point in the context of claims 1 and 5. Upon further insertion of the knife blade, as shown in Figure 7 of Stanevich, the knife blade then

contacts the lamellae at point 24 and no longer contacts the lamellae at point 22. It is the contact at point 24 which maintains the free ends 20 of the lamellae in contact with the retention spring 14. However, point 24 is at the opposite end of the contact lamellae and, therefore, is not in direct proximity to where the retention spring 14 and contact lamellae rest against each other (adjacent point 20).

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants respectfully submit that the combination of Risser et al. and Stanevich does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of “the contact lamellae are configured to spring off freely at a beginning of an insertion of a knife blade into the contact segment, and, after further insertion of the knife blade, *only free ends of the contact lamellae configured to come to rest against the spring element in direct proximity to the contact point with the knife blade maintaining contact with the contact segment and contact point,*” as required by claim 1, and “*the contact lamellae are configured to interact with the knife blade, which maintains contact with the contact segment and contact point, so as to contact the spring element in direct proximity to the at least one contact point,*” as required by claim 5. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Risser et al. and Stanevich does not render unpatentable claims 1 and 5.

Claims 2 to 4 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features of claim 1. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 5 and therefore include all of the features of claim 5. As more fully set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Risser et al. and Stanevich does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 1, from which claims 2 to 4 ultimately depend, and claim 5, from which claims 6 and 7 depend. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Risser et al. and Stanevich does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the same reasons provided above in support of the patentability of claims 1 and 5, respectively.

In view of all of the foregoing, reversal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

8. CLAIMS APPENDIX

A “Claims Appendix” is attached hereto and appears on the two (2) pages numbered “Claims Appendix 1” to “Claims Appendix 2.”

9. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence has been submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132. No other evidence has been entered by the Examiner or relied upon by Appellants in

the appeal. An "Evidence Appendix" is nevertheless attached hereto and appears on the one (1) page numbered "Evidence Appendix."

10. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

As indicated above in Section 2, "[t]here are no other prior or pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings known by the undersigned, or believed by the undersigned to be known to Appellants or the assignee, ROBERT BOSCH GmbH, 'which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.'" As such, there no "decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to [37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii)]" to be submitted. A "Related Proceedings Appendix" is nevertheless attached hereto and appears on the one (1) page numbered "Related Proceedings Appendix."

11. CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons indicated above, Appellants respectfully submit that the art of record does not disclose or suggest the subject matter as recited in the claims of the above-identified application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter as set forth in the claims of the present application is patentable.

In view of all of the foregoing, reversal of all of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/21/08

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/, Reg. No. 42,194
Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. An electrical connector in the form of a socket contact, comprising:
an inner contact part; and

a spring element adapted to be placed over the inner contact part,
wherein the inner contact part includes:

an attachment part for receiving a bare end of an electrical line,
a center segment, and

a contact segment having a contact part, the contact part having at least three
contact lamellae pointing away from the center segment, the contact lamellae being
freely movable, each of the contact lamellae having at least one contact point for
producing an electrical plug connection to a knife blade; and

wherein the contact lamellae are configured to spring off freely at a beginning of an
insertion of a knife blade into the contact segment, and, after further insertion of the knife
blade, only free ends of the contact lamellae configured to come to rest against the spring
element in direct proximity to the contact point with the knife blade maintaining contact with
the contact segment and contact point.

2. The electrical connector according to claim 1, wherein the contact lamellae are
formed in the shape of fingers and are only connected to each other at an end pointing to the
center segment.

3. The electrical connector according to claim 1, further comprising, in a region of
the free end of the contact lamellae, support elements situated at an external retention spring.

4. The electrical connector according to claim 3, wherein the external retention spring
substantially completely surrounds the contact part and, thus, forms lateral limiting elements
for the contact lamellae.

5. An electrical connector in the form of a socket contact, comprising:
an inner contact part; and
a spring element adapted to be placed over the inner contact part,
wherein the inner contact part includes:

an attachment part for receiving a bare end of an electrical line,
a center segment, and

a contact segment having a contact part, the contact part having at least three contact lamellae pointing away from the center segment, the contact lamellae being freely movable, each of the contact lamellae having at least one contact point for producing an electrical plug connection to a knife blade;

wherein the contact lamellae are spaced from the spring element along an entire length of the contact lamellae prior to insertion of a knife blade into the contact part; and

wherein the contact lamellae are configured to interact with the knife blade, which maintains contact with the contact segment and contact point, so as to contact the spring element in direct proximity to the at least one contact point.

6. The electrical connector according to claim 5, wherein free ends of the contact lamellae are configured to spring off freely towards the spring element upon partial insertion of a knife blade into the contact part.

7. The electrical connector according to claim 5, wherein the free ends of the contact lamellae are configured to contact the spring upon complete insertion of the knife blade.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence has been submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§1.130, 1.131, or 1.132. No other evidence has been entered by the Examiner or relied upon by Appellants in the appeal.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

As indicated above in Section 2 of this Appeal Brief, “[t]here are no other prior or pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings known by the undersigned, or believed by the undersigned to be known to Appellants or the assignee, ROBERT BOSCH GmbH, ‘which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board’s decision in the pending appeal.’” As such, there no “decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to [37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii)]” to be submitted.